DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 80
VICKSBURG, MISSISSIPPI 39181-0080

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

16 JUL 2013

CEMVD-PD-SP

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Rock Island District

SUBJECT: Review Plan (RP) Approval for Plum River, Savanna, Illinois, Continuing Authority Program Section 205-Flood Risk Management, Review Plan (RP)

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CEMVR-PM-M, 11 June 2013, subject: Plum River, Savanna, Illinois, Continuing Authority Program Section 205-Flood Risk Management, Review Plan (encl 1).

b. Memorandum, CEMVD-RB-T, 12 July 2013, subject: Plum River, Savanna, Illinois, Continuing Authority Program Section 205-Flood Risk Management, Review Plan (encl 2).

c. EC 1165-2-214, CECW, 15 December 2012, subject: Civil Works Review Policy.

2. The enclosed Review Plan (encl 3) is a combined decision document and implementation document review plan. It includes the MVD Review Plan Checklist for CAP and has been prepared in accordance with EC 1165-2-214. The RP has been coordinated between the Business Technical Division and the Upper District Support Team.

3. I hereby approve this RP, which is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this RP or its execution will require new written approval from this office. Non-substantive changes to this RP do not require further approval. The District should post the approved RP to its web site.

4. The MVD point of contact for this action is Mr. Gabe Harris, CEMVD-PD-SP, (601) 634-5926.

3 Encls

EDWARD E. BELK, JR., P.E., SES
Director of Programs

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, ROCK ISLAND DISTRICT
PO BOX 2004 CLOCK TOWER BUILDING
ROCK ISLAND, ILLINOIS 61204-2004

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

JUN 11 2013

CEMVR-PM-M

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, US Army Corps of Engineers, Mississippi Valley Division (CEMVD-PD-SP/Harris), PO Box 80, 1400 Walnut Street, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39181-0080

SUBJECT: Plum River, Savanna, Illinois, Continuing Authority Program Section 205 - Flood Risk Management, Review Plan (RP).

1. The Subject RP (Encl 1); MVD RP Checklist (Encl 2); and Agency Technical Review Certification (Encl 3) for the Plum River Section 205 Project are submitted for your review and approval. The RP is for both the Feasibility Phase (Decision Document) and the Implementation Phase (P&S). An electronic copy of the Subject RP and enclosures have been sent to Mr. Gabe Harris, CEMVD-PD-SP.

2. The point of contact for this project is Mr. Chris Haring, Project Manager, at (309) 794-5885 or e-mail: christopher.p.haring@usace.army.mil.

Encl
as

MARK J. DESCHENES
COL, EN
Commanding

CEMVD-RB-T 12 July 2013

MEMORANDUM FOR CEMVD-PD-SP (Mark Moore)

SUBJECT: Plum River, Savanna, Illinois, Continuing Authority Program Section 205-Flood Risk Management, Review Plan

1. Reference memorandum, CEMVR-PM-M, 11 June 2013, subject as above.

2. This office concurs with subject Review Plan.

3. The RB-T point of contact is Mr. Jack McDaniel, 601-634-7175.

ROBERT H. FITZGERALD, P.E.
Chief, Business Technical
Division

REVIEW PLAN

USING THE MVD MODEL REVIEW PLAN

for

Continuing Authorities Program

Section 103 and 205 Projects, or Projects directed by Guidance to use CAP processes

Plum River, Savanna, Illinois

Section *205* Project

Rock Island District

MSC Approval Date: *Pending*

Last Revision Date: *none*

REVIEW PLAN
USING THE MVD MODEL REVIEW PLAN

Plum River, Savanna, Illinois
Section *205* Project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	**Purpose and Requirements**	1
2.	**Review Management Organization (RMO) Coordination**	1
3.	**Project Information**	1
4.	**District Quality Control (DQC)**	2
5.	**Agency Technical Review (ATR)**	2
6.	**Independent External Peer Review (IEPR)**	4
7.	**Policy and Legal Compliance Review**	6
8.	**Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) Review and Certification**	7
9.	**Model Certification and Approval**	7
10.	**Review Schedules and Costs**	8
11.	**Public Participation**	8
12.	**Review Plan Approval and Updates**	9
13.	**Review Plan Points of Contact**	9
Attachment 1: Team Rosters		10
Attachment 2: Review Plan Revisions		11

REVIEW PLAN
Plum River, Savanna, Illinois CAP Section 205

1. Purpose and Requirements

a. **Purpose.** This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the *Plum River, Savanna, Illinois*, Section *205* products. *The products for review are the decision and implementation documents and all associated work products including; the environmental and cultural assessment, plan formulation, cost estimate,economic analysis, hydraulic and hydrologic analysis, geotechnical analysis, real estate plan, drawings and specifications, and any additional technical work products that are generated as part of the decision document. The feasibility report will provide planning, engineering, and sufficient construction details of the recommended plan to allow final design and construction to proceed in the implementation phase, subsequent to approval of the document.*

Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended, authorizes USACE to study, design and construct flood risk management projects. This is a Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) which focuses on water resource related projects of relatively smaller scope, cost and complexity. Unlike the traditional Corps' civil works projects that are of wider scope and complexity, the Continuing Authorities Program is a delegated authority to plan, design, and construct certain types of water resource and environmental restoration projects without specific Congressional authorization.

Additional Information on this program can be found in Engineering Regulation 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Amendment #2.

b. Applicability. This review plan is based on the MVD Model Review Plan for Section 103 or 205 Projects or Programs directed by guidance to follow CAP processes, which is applicable to projects that do not require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)..

c. References

(1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review Policy, 15 December 2012.
(2) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, CECW-P, dated 19 January 2011.
(3) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 March 2010.
(4) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 September 2006.
(5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 January 2007.
(6) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 November 2007.

2. Review Management Organization (RMO) Coordination

The RMO is responsible for managing the overall peer review effort described in this review plan. The RMO for Section *205 Projects* is MVD. MVD will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the Agency Technical Review (ATR). If Type I Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) will be performed, MVD will coordinate the IEPR effort with the appropriate PCX, which will administer the Type I IEPR. The home District will post the approved review plan on its public website. A copy of the approved review plan (and any updates) will be provided to the *FRM-PCX* to keep the PCX apprised of requirements and review schedules.

3. Project Information

a. Decision Documents. The *Plum River, Savanna, Illinois* decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F, Amendment #2. The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is MVD. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along

with the decision document. *Plans and Specifications (P&S) will also be prepared for implementation of the project and will undergo ATR review and a Safety Assurance Review (SAR) - Type II IEPR.*

b. Study/Project Description. *The project sponsor is the City of Savanna, Illinois, which is located at River Mile 537.3 on the left bank of the Mississippi River. It is approximately 120 miles west of Chicago, IL and approximately 60 miles upstream of Davenport, IA. The Plum River empties into the Mississippi River just downstream from Savanna. It has several tributaries and a drainage area of approximately 300 square miles. The study area is the floodplain of the Plum River to the south and southeast of Savanna.*

The study is a single-purpose, flood risk management study that will evaluate alternatives to reduce future flood-induced damages to the City of Savanna, IL. Potential measures for evaluation as part of this study include; levees, floodwalls, relocation, flood proofing, etc. A Federal Interest Determination Memo was approved on February 11, 2013, which evaluated alternatives with costs ranging from approximately $3 million to $5 million.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and level of Review. *The MVD Model Review Plan has been utilized to assess the level of review required for the project based its status as a Continuing Authorities Program (CAP), Section 205 Project. The scale and scope of this project is limited under the Section 205, Small Flood Risk Management Project CAP, which provides local flood risk management by the construction or improvement of flood control works or non-structural measures. Each project is limited to a Federal cost share of not more than $7 million. This Federal limitation includes all project-related costs for feasibility studies, planning, design, construction, and supervision and administration. Due to these Program limitations, any proposed project would inherently be limited in size and scope, and would not likely utilize novel techniques that would be associated with an increased level of risk. This project is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project due to its limited scope and support by the local sponsor and stakeholders.*

d. In-Kind Contributions. Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to District Quality Control (DQC) and ATR, similar to any products developed by USACE. *No in-kind products are anticipated.*

4. District Quality Control (DQC)

All decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC prior to ATR. The home district shall manage DQC in accordance with the MVD and district Quality Management Plan. *The DQC review will include all work products, reports, evaluations, and assessments. The DQC review will be conducted utilizing DrChecks. All comments and subsequent backchecks will be captured in DrChecks and provided to the ATR team.*

5. Agency Technical Review (ATR)

One ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.), however additional ATRs may be performed if deemed warranted. ATR will normally be performed on the AFB documentation with a continuing review on major changes leading up to completion and the District Commander signing the final report. ATR is managed within USACE by the designated RMO and is conducted by a qualified team from outside the home district that is not involved in the day-to-day production of the project/product. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel. The ATR team lead will be from within the home MSC.

a. Products to Undergo ATR. *The products to undergo ATR include; the environmental and cultural assessment, plan formulation, cost estimate, incremental cost analysis, hydraulic and hydrologic analysis, geotechnical analysis, real estate plan, and plates in addition to any of technical work products that are generated as part of the decision document. The ATR lead will be involved in milestones requiring vertical team participation including; the Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM), Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB), and In-Progress Reviews (IPRs). Review of all work products by the ATR team will be conducted prior to AFB.*

b. Required ATR Team Expertise. *Approximately seven ATR team members will be needed to conduct the review and should mirror the disciplines represented in the PDT. The ATR lead will also serve as the reviewer for a specific discipline.*

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	***Expertise Required***
ATR Lead	*The ATR lead should be a senior-level professional preferably with experience in preparing Section 205 and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. Typically, the ATR lead will also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline (such as planning, economics, environmental resources, etc). The ATR Lead MUST be from outside the Rock Island District.*
Planning	*The Planning reviewer should be a senior-level water resources planner with experience in flood risk management projects of a similar scale to a CAP 205 project and have a thorough understanding of alternative development and plan selection based on the economic and cost engineering analysis resulting in net benefits and general planning policy.*
Economics	*The economics reviewer should be a senior-level economics professional with experience in flood risk management projects and the techniques used to assess the net benefits of proposed alternatives as well as the cost benefit ratio for the selected plan.*
Environmental Resources	*The Environmental resources reviewer should be a senior-level environmental specialist with experience coordinating NEPA requirements and assessing environmental impacts.*
Hydraulic Engineering	*The hydraulic engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of hydraulics and have a thorough understanding of open channel dynamics, application of levees and flood walls, and non-structural solutions involving flood warning systems and flood proofing. The Hydraulic Engineer will also need to be an expert in computer modeling techniques that will be used for this project, which have not yet been determined but may include HEC-RAS, FLO-2D, UNET, or TABS, etc.*
Geotechnical Engineering	*The geotechnical engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of geotechnical engineering with particular emphasis on the design and construction of levees, concrete floodwalls, and related components and will have a working knowledge of construction techniques and methods.*
Civil Engineering	*The civil engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of civil engineering with particular emphasis on the design and construction of levees, concrete floodwalls, and related components and will have a working knowledge of construction techniques and methods.*

Cost Engineering	*The cost reviewer will be a certified cost reviewer as assigned by the Cost DX (Walla Walla District) and should be familiar with cost estimating for construction techniques associated with flood risk management including the construction of levees/floodwalls and nonstructural measures such as floodproofing and ring levees.*

c. Documentation of ATR. DrChecks review software will be used to document all ATR comments, responses and associated resolutions accomplished throughout the review process. Comments should be limited to those that are required to ensure adequacy of the product. Any editorial comments should be provided informally by email to the PDT.

6. Independent External Peer Review (IEPR)

IEPR may be required for decision documents under certain circumstances. IEPR is the most independent level of review, and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of USACE is warranted. A risk-informed decision, as described in EC 1165-2-214, is made as to whether IEPR is appropriate. IEPR panels will consist of independent, recognized experts from outside of the USACE in the appropriate disciplines, representing a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted. There are two types of IEPR:

- Type I IEPR. Type I IEPR reviews are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on project studies. Type I IEPR panels assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analysis, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alternative plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in the evaluation of environmental impacts of proposed projects, and biological opinions of the project study. Type I IEPR will cover the entire decision document or action and will address all underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study. For decision documents where a Type II IEPR (Safety Assurance Review) is anticipated during project implementation, safety assurance shall also be addressed during the Type I IEPR per EC 1165-2-214.

For Section 103 and 205 decision documents prepared under the MVD Model Review Plan, Type I IEPR may or may not be required.

- Type II IEPR. Type II IEPR, or Safety Assurance Review (SAR), are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on design and construction activities for hurricane, storm, and flood risk management projects or other projects where existing and potential hazards pose a significant threat to human life. Type II IEPR panels will conduct reviews of the design and construction activities prior to initiation of physical construction and, until construction activities are completed, periodically thereafter on a regular schedule. The reviews shall consider the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities in assuring public health safety and welfare.

For Section 103 and 205 decision documents prepared under the MVD Model Review Plan, Type II IEPR may or may not be anticipated to be required in the design and implementation phase. The decision on whether Type II IEPR is required will be verified and documented in the review plan prepared for the design and implementation phase of the project.

a. Decision on IEPR. It is the policy of USACE that Section *205* project decision documents should undergo Type I IEPR unless ALL of the following criteria are met:

- Federal action is not justified by life safety or failure of the project would not pose a significant threat to human life;
- Life safety consequences and risk of non-performance of a project are not greater than under existing conditions;
- There is no request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
- The project does not require an EIS;
- The project/study is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project;
- The project/study is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project;
- The information in the decision document or anticipated project design is not likely to be based on novel methods, involve the use of innovative materials or techniques, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices;
- The project design is not anticipated to require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule; and
- There are no other circumstances where the Chief of Engineers or Director of Civil Works determines Type I IEPR is warranted.

Further, if Type I IEPR will not be performed:

- Risks of non-performance and residual flooding must be fully disclosed in the decision document and in a public forum prior to final approval of the decision document;
- The non-Federal sponsor must develop a Floodplain Management Plan, including a risk management plan and flood response plan (and evacuation plan if appropriate for the conditions), during the feasibility phase; and
- The non-Federal sponsor must explicitly acknowledge the risks and responsibilities in writing in a letter or other document (such as the Floodplain Management Plan) submitted to the Corps of Engineers along with the final decision document.

The decision on whether the above criteria are met (and a Type I IEPR exclusion is appropriate) is the responsibility of the MVD Commander. Additional factors the MVD Commander might consider include in deciding if an exclusion is appropriate include, but are not limited to: Hydrograph/period of flooding, warning time, depth of flooding, velocity of flooding, nature of area protected, and population protected.

Conducting a Type I IEPR is not anticipated for the feasibility phase of the project because it does not trigger any of the criteria listed above which would require the added level of review. This project does not pose a significant threat to human safety and project non-performance does not increase the risk greater than the existing conditions. However, it is anticipated that a Type II IEPR – Safety Assurace Review would be conducted during the implementation phase to ensure that project non-performance would not result in an increased risk to human health. The SAR would be conducted by experts that are external from the USACE that have design and construction expertise in levee safety projects. The SAR shall consider the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities in assuring health, safety, and welfare. The SAR requirement is based on Section 2035 of WRDA 2007, the OMB Peer Review Bulletin, and other USACE policy considerations.

Due to the limited scale, scope and lack of complexity, a one-person SAR panel will be utilized for the Plum River Type II IEPR - SAR. This individual will have broad civil, geotechnical, and structural engineering expertise in levee and floodwall FRM projects. The SAR reviewer's experience shall be at the Level 2 expertise level with at least 15 years experience and shall be a licensed professional engineer

in the State of Illinois. Per guidance, the SAR shall be targeted to cost between 0.9% and 1.5% of the project costs.

b. Products to Undergo Type I IEPR. *N/A.*

c. Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise. *N/A.*

d. Documentation of Type I IEPR. The IEPR panel will be selected and managed by an Outside Eligible Organization (OEO) per EC 1165-2-214, Appendix D. Panel comments will be compiled by the OEO and should address the adequacy and acceptability of the economic, engineering and environmental methods, models, and analyses used. IEPR comments should generally include the same four key parts as described for ATR comments in Section 4.a. above. The OEO will prepare a final Review Report that will accompany the publication of the final decision document and shall:

- Disclose the names of the reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of each reviewer;
- Include the charge to the reviewers;
- Describe the nature of their review and their findings and conclusions; and
- Include a verbatim copy of each reviewer's comments (either with or without specific attributions), or represent the views of the group as a whole, including any disparate and dissenting views.

The final Review Report will be submitted by the OEO no later than 60 days following the close of the public comment period for the draft decision document. USACE shall consider all recommendations contained in the Review Report and prepare a written response for all recommendations adopted or not adopted. The final decision document will summarize the Review Report and USACE response. The Review Report and USACE response will be made available to the public, including through electronic means on the internet.

e. Documentation of Type II IEPR – Safety Assurance Review. The Safety Assurance Reviewer will be selected and managed by an Outside Eligible Organization (OEO) per EC 1165-2-214, Appendix D. Review comments will be compiled by the OEO and should address the adequacy and acceptability of the economic, engineering and environmental methods, models, and analyses used. IEPR comments should generally include the same four key parts as described for ATR comments in Section 4.a. above. The OEO will prepare a final Review Report that will accompany the publication of the final decision document and shall:

- *Disclose the name of the reviewer, his or her organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of the reviewer;*
- *Include the charge to the reviewer;*
- *Describe the nature of his/her review and the findings and conclusions; and*
- *Include a verbatim copy of the reviewer's comments.*

USACE shall consider all recommendations contained in the Review Report and prepare a written response for all recommendations adopted or not adopted. The Review Report and USACE response will be made available to the public, including through electronic means on the internet.

7. Policy and Legal Compliance Review

All decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100.

These reviews culminate in determinations that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the MVD Commander. DQC and ATR augment and complement the policy review processes by addressing compliance with pertinent published Army policies, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents.

8. Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) Review and Certification.

For CAP projects, ATR of the costs may be conducted by pre-certified district cost personnel within the region or by the Walla Walla Cost DX. The pre-certified list of cost personnel has been established and is maintained by the Cost DX at https://kme.usace.army.mil/EC/cost/CostAtr/default.aspx. The cost ATR member will coordinate with the Cost DX for execution of cost ATR and cost certification. The Cost DX will be responsible for final cost certification and may be delegated at the discretion of the Cost DX.

9. Model Certification and Approval.

Approval of planning models under EC 1105-2-412 is not required for CAP projects. MSC commanders remain responsible for assuring the quality of the analyses used in these projects. ATR will be used to ensure that models and analyses are compliant with Corps policy, theoretically sound, computationally accurate, transparent, described to address any limitations of the model or its use, and documented in study reports.

EC 1105-2-412 does not cover engineering models used in planning. The responsible use of well-known and proven USACE developed and commercial engineering software will continue and the professional practice of documenting the application of the software and modeling results will be followed. As part of the USACE Scientific and Engineering Technology (SET) Initiative, many engineering models have been identified as preferred or acceptable for use on Corps studies and these models should be used whenever appropriate. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

Planning and Engineering Models. The following models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document: *It is assumed that HEC-FDA and HEC-RAS will be used for this feasibility effort, although that has not been definitively determined as this early stage of project planning.*

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study
HEC-FDA 1.2.4 (Flood Damage Analysis)	*The Hydrologic Engineering Center's Flood Damage Reduction Analysis (HEC-FDA) program provides the capability for integrated hydrologic engineering and economic analysis for formulating and evaluating flood risk management plans using risk-based analysis methods. The program will be used to evaluate and compare the future without- and with-project plans along the Wild River near River City to aid in the selection of a recommended plan to manage flood risk.*
HEC-RAS 4.0 (River Analysis System)	*The Hydrologic Engineering Center's River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) program provides the capability to perform one-dimensional steady and unsteady flow river hydraulics calculations. The program will be used for steady flow analysis to evaluate the future without- and with-project conditions along the Plum River.*

10. Review Schedules and Costs

- **ATR Schedule and Cost.**

Event	Kick-off	Reviewer Comments End	PDT Evaluation	Back Check	Complete
ATR of AFB Products	06/01/14	06/15/14	06/30/14	07/15/14	07/30/14

Reviewer	ATR of AFB Products
ATR Lead (AFB review included)	$3,000
Planner	$3,000
Economist	$3,000
Civil Engineer	$3,000
Environmental Resources Specialist	$3,000
Cost Estimator (Staffed by Walla-Walla)	$3,000
Geotechnical Engineer	$3,000
H&H	$3,000
TOTAL	$24,000

- **Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost.**
  Not anticipated for this project.

- **Type II IEPR Schedule and Cost.**

Event	Kick-off	Reviewer Comments End	PDT Evaluation	Back Check	Complete
IEPR of P&S	08/01/15	09/01/15	09/30/15	10/15/15	10/30/15

Type II IEPR –Saftey Assurance Review	Cost
Civil Engineer	$20,000
Contractor's Management Activities	$20,000
TOTAL	$40,000

11. Public Participation

State and Federal resource agencies may be invited to participate in the study covered by this review plan as partner agencies or as technical members of the PDT, as appropriate. *The City of Savanna, Illinois (Local Sponsor) will have a representative participate on the PDT. Upon completion of the AFB milestone, with approval from MVD, there will be a 30-day public review period of the document. There will also be coordination with the resource agencies in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.*

12. Review Plan Approval and Updates

The MVD DST Chief is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the MVD Model Review Plan is appropriate for the specific project covered by the plan. The review plan is a living document and may change as the study progresses. The home district is responsible for keeping the review plan up to date. Minor changes to the review plan since the last MVD approval are documented in Attachment 2. Significant changes to the review plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) should be reapproved by MVD following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in MVD determining that use of the MVD Model Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-214. The latest version of the review plan, along with the MVD approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

13. Review Plan Points of Contact

Public questions and/or comments on this review plan can be directed to the following points of contact:

- *Christopher Haring, Project Manager, Rock Island District, (309) 794-5885*
- *William Gabe Harris Rock Island District Support Team Program Manager, (601) 634-5926*

Attachment 1: Team Rosters

The PDT has not yet been assembled, pending the receipt of funding for feasibility initiation. ThePDT roster will be added at a later time.

Attachment 2: Review Plan Revisions

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page/Paragraph Number

REVIEW PLAN
Plum River, Savanna, Illinois CAP Section 205

MVD CAP Review Plan Checklist

Date: **April 2013**
Originating District: Rock Island
Project/Study Title: Plum River, Savanna, Illinois
P2# and AMSCO#: 354285
District POC: Christopher Haring, Project Manager (309) 794-5885
MSC Reviewer: William Gabe Harris, DST
CAP Authority: Section 205, Small Flood Risk Management
Other Program Directed to follow CAP Processes:

Please fill out this checklist and submit with the draft Review Plan when coordinating with the MSC. Any evaluation boxes checked "No" may indicate the project may not be able to use the MVD Model Review Plan. Further explanation may be needed or a project specific review plan may be required. Additional coordination and issue resolution may be required prior to MSC approval of the Review Plan. Checklist may be limited to Section I or Section II or Both, depending on content of review plan (or subsequent amendments).

Section I - Decision Documents

REQUIREMENT	EVALUATION
1. Is the Review Plan (RP) for a Continuing Authorities Project? **Or Other Program Directed to follow CAP Processes?**	Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does it include a cover page identifying it as following the Model RP and listing the project/study title, originating district or office, and date of the plan?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does it include a table of contents?	b. Yes ☒ No ☐
c. Is the purpose of the RP clearly stated?	c. Yes ☒ No ☐
d. Does it reference the Project Management Plan (PMP) of which the RP is a component?	d. Yes ☐ No ☒
e. Does it succinctly describe the levels of review: District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), and Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) if applicable for Sec 103 or Sec 205?	e. Yes ☒ No ☐
f. Does it include a paragraph stating the title, subject, and purpose of the decision document to be reviewed?	f. Yes ☒ No ☐
g. Does it list the names and disciplines of the Project Delivery Team (PDT)?* **Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.* **Comments:** *The Feasibility Study for this project will be initiated upon the receipt of funding. Until such time, the development of the PMP and assignment of the PDT will be on hold.*	g. Yes ☐ No ☒

2. Is the RP detailed enough to assess the necessary level and focus of the reviews?	Yes ☒ No ☐
3. Does the RP define the appropriate level of review for the project/study?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it state that DQC will be managed by the home district in accordance with the MVD and district Quality Management Plans?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does it state that ATR will be managed by MVD?	b. Yes ☒ No ☐
c. Does it state whether IEPR will be performed? For Sec 103 and Sec 205, see additional questions in 5. below. **Comments:**	c. Yes ☒ No ☐
4. Does the RP explain how ATR will be accomplished?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it identify the anticipated number of reviewers?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review (not simply a list of disciplines)?	b. Yes ☒ No ☐
c. Does it indicate that ATR team members will be from outside the home district?	c. Yes ☒ No ☐
d. Does it indicate where the ATR team leader will be from?	d. Yes ☐ No ☒
e. If the reviewers are listed by name, does the RP describe the qualifications and years of relevant experience of the ATR team members?* **Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.* **Comments:**	e. Yes ☐ No ☒
5. For Sec 103 and Sec 205 projects, does the RP explain how IEPR will be accomplished?	Yes ☒ No ☐ n/a ☐
a. Is an exclusion being requested, requiring CG approval?	a. Yes ☐ No ☒
b. Does it provide a defensible rationale for the decision on IEPR?	b. Yes ☒ No ☐
c. If IEPR is required, does it state that IEPR will be managed by an Outside Eligible Organization, external to the Corps of Engineers?	c. Yes ☒ No ☐
d. If IEPR is required, does the RP indicate which PCX will manage the IEPR and whether any coordination with the PCX has occurred? **Comments:**	d. Yes ☒ No ☐
6. Does the RP address review of sponsor in-kind contributions?	Yes ☒ No ☐

7. Does the RP address how the review will be documented?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR and IEPR comments using Dr Checks? b. Does the RP explain how the IEPR will be documented in a Review Report? c. Does the RP document how written responses to the IEPR Review Report will be prepared? c. Does the RP detail how the district will disseminate the final IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the IEPR on the internet and include them in the applicable decision document? **Comments:**	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☒ No ☐ n/a ☐ c. Yes ☒ No ☐ n/a ☐ d. Yes ☒ No ☐ n/a ☐
8. Does the RP address Policy Compliance and Legal Review?	Yes ☒ No ☐
9. Does the RP present the tasks, timing and sequence (including deferrals), and costs of reviews?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it provide a schedule for ATR including review of the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) materials and final report? b. Does it present the timing and sequencing for IEPR? c. Does it include cost estimates for the reviews?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☒ No ☐ n/a ☐ c. Yes ☒ No ☐
10. Does the RP indicate the study will address Safety Assurance factors? Factors to be considered include: • Where failure leads to significant threat to human life • Novel methods\complexity\ precedent-setting models\policy changing conclusions • Innovative materials or techniques • Design lacks redundancy, resiliency of robustness • Unique construction sequence or acquisition plans • Reduced\overlapping design construction schedule	Yes ☒ No ☐ n/a ☐ **Comments:**
11. Does the RP address opportunities for public participation?	Yes ☒ No ☐
12. Does the RP indicate ATR of cost estimates will be conducted by pre-certified district cost personnel who will coordinate with the Walla Walla Cost DX?	Yes ☒ No ☐
13. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?	Yes ☐ No ☒

Section II - Implementation Documents

Please fill out this checklist and submit with the draft Review Plan or subsequent Review Plan amendments when coordinating with the MSC. For DQC, the District is the RMO; for ATR and Type II IEPR, MVD is the RMO. Any evaluation boxes checked "No" indicate the RP possibly may not comply with MVD Model Review Plan and should be explained. Additional coordination and issue resolution may be required prior to MVD approval of the Review Plan.

REQUIREMENT	EVALUATION
1. Are the implementation documents/products described in the review or subsequent amendments?	Yes ☒ No ☐
2. Does the RP contain documentation of risk-informed decisions on which levels of review are appropriate?	Yes ☒ No ☐
3. Does the RP present the tasks, timing, and sequence of the reviews (including deferrals)?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it provide an overall review schedule that shows timing and sequence of all reviews?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does the review plan establish a milestone schedule aligned with the critical features of the project design and construction?	b. Yes ☒ No ☐
4. Does the RP address engineering model review requirements?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it list the models and data anticipated to be used in developing recommendations?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does the RP identify any areas of risk and uncertainty associated with the use of the proposed models?	b. Yes ☒ No ☐
c. Does it indicate the certification/approval status of those models and if review of any model(s) will be needed?	c. Yes ☒ No ☐
d. If needed, does the RP propose the appropriate level of review for the model(s) and how it will be accomplished?	d. Yes ☒ No ☐
5. Does the RP explain how and when there will be opportunities for the public to comment on the study or project to be reviewed?	Yes ☒ No ☐
6. Does the RP address expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor?	Yes ☒ No ☐
If expected in-kind contributions are to be provided by the sponsor, does the RP list the expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor?	Yes ☒ No ☐

7. Does the RP explain how the reviews will be documented?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR comments using Dr Checks and Type II IEPR published comments and responses pertaining to the design and construction activities summarized in a report reviewed and approved by the MSC and posted on the home district website?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does the RP explain how the Type II IEPR will be documented in a Review Report?	b. Yes ☒ No ☐
c. Does the RP document how written responses to the Type II IEPR Review Report will be prepared?	c. Yes ☒ No ☐
d. Does the RP detail how the district/MVD will disseminate the final Type II IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the Type II IEPR on the internet?	d. Yes ☒ No ☐
8. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?	Yes ☐ No ☒

Completion of Agency Technical Review

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the *Decision and Implementation Documents* for *the Plum River, Savanna Illinois CAP Section 205 Project*. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project's Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-214. During the ATR, compliance with established policy principles and procedures utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses, alternatives evaluated, the appropriateness of data used and level obtained, and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing US Army Corps of Engineers policy. The ATR also assessed the District Quality Control (DQC) documentation and made the determination that the DQC activities employed appear to be appropriate and effective. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved and the comments have been closed in DrChecks[sm].

SIGNATURE _____ _____
Name Date
ATR Team Leader
Office Symbol/Company

SIGNATURE _____ _____
Name Date
Project Manager, *Rock Island District*
PM-M

SIGNATURE _____ _____
Name Date
Review Management Office Representative
Office Symbol

Certification of Agency Technical Review

Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows: *Describe the major technical concerns and their resolution.*

As noted above, all concerns resulting from the ATR of the project have been fully resolved.

SIGNATURE _____ _____
Name Date
Chief, Engineering Division, *Rock Island District*
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ _____
Name Date
Chief, Planning Division
Office Symbol